

From List II of substrate peptide form species, applicants elect **dimmer of monomer-proline-monomer, and sub-species kemptide/SEQ ID NO: 1**.

From List III of reactive proteins, applicants elect **antibody/fluorescence labeled antibody and sub-species Cy3-labeled anti-phosphorylation serine antibody**.

Concerning the further requirement of claims readable on the elected species, the claims readable on **leptin as the List I protein** are **claims 1-10**.

The claims readable on the List II substrate peptide species of **dimmer of monomer-proline-monomer, and sub-species kemptide/SEQ ID NO: 1** are **claims 1-10**.

The claims readable on the List III **antibody/fluorescence labeled antibody and sub-species Cy3-labeled anti-phosphorylation serine antibody** are **claims 1-7 and 9-10**.

These elections are made with traverse.

The examiner has stated that the species identified at pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action lack unity of invention since they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1. Nonetheless, both linker protein and substrate peptide are encompassed by claim 1, and relate to one another. They are combined with one another to provide a protein chip capable of allowing an increase in the reactivity between peptide with a low molecular weight and an enzyme with high molecular weight and between the peptide and the reactive antibody. Accordingly, these aspects of the claimed subject matter embody a single inventive concept.

The examiner has further contended that the invention of claim 5 is another generic invention in relation to claim 1. It is pointed out, however, that claim 5 further limits the protein chip of claim 1 to a specific substrate. Accordingly, claims 1 and 5 embody unity of invention with respect to their subject matter.

The examiner also has contended that claim 6 embodies another generic invention. In response, it is pointed out that claim 6 relates to a method for analyzing interaction between a reactive protein and its substrate peptide using the protein chip of claim 1. Accordingly, the protein chip recited in claim 1 is essential for carrying out the method of claim 6. Claims 1 and 6 therefore embody subject matter aspects of the same invention.

The examiner correspondingly is requested to reconsider the restriction/election requirements in light of the foregoing remarks, and to responsively examine all aspects of claims 1-10 as embodying a single invention.

Respectfully submitted,

/steven j. hultquist/

Steven J. Hultquist
Reg. No. 28,021
Attorney for Applicants

**INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY/
TECHNOLOGY LAW**
Phone: (919) 419-9350
Fax: (919) 419-9354
Attorney File No.: 4240-123

<p>The USPTO is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment of fees properly payable for this document to Deposit Account No. 08-3284</p>
